

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Clarifying amendments have been made to Claims 87, 112, 121, 126, 128, 143, 147, 160, and 176. Claim 184 has been canceled and new Claims 188 and 189 have been added. Claims 91-104, 110-115 and 119-187 have been withdrawn. Accordingly, Claims 89-183 and 185-189 are pending in the present application. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation that Claims 106-109 and 118 were deemed to contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 89, 90, 105, and 116-117 were rejected in an Office Action dated August 9, 2006 ("Office Action") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,716,076, issued to Van Der Knaap et al. ("Van Der Knaap"). Claim 89 was also objected to because of minor informalities. For the reasons that will be discussed in detail below, applicant respectfully asserts that the present application is in condition for allowance.

### Claim Objections

Claim 89 stands objected to because of a minor informality. Specifically, the Office Action states that the phrase "a tie structure" in line 6 should be "said tie structure." Applicant has amended Claim 89 to address this informality, and thus, request withdrawal of the objection to Claim 89.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 89, 90, 105, and 116-117 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Der Knaap. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to these claims. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d. 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicant

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

respectfully asserts that Van Der Knaap fails to teach each and every element of the rejected claims.

Claim 89 is directed to a vehicle suspension system for a vehicle a body, in which the body has a pitch center and a roll center. The vehicle further has at least one surface engaging vehicle support assembly and a reaction center. The suspension system includes at least one tie structure interposed between the vehicle support assembly and the body of the vehicle, a first interconnecting system; a second interconnecting system, and a load control system.

Claim 89 recites that the suspension system includes a second interconnecting system configured and arranged for interconnecting the tie structure(s) and the body about the pitch center or the roll center. Upon forces being imposed on the vehicle during operation of the vehicle, the body rotates around the center(s) of rotation relative to the tie structure, in the direction opposite to the direction of the forces acting on the vehicle in pitch or roll.

In complete contrast, as the result of the configuration of the suspension of Van Der Knaap, the body 4 rolls outwardly about its roll center upon forces applied to the body that are generated by cornering, or pitches forwardly or backwardly about its pitch center upon forces applied to the body from braking or accelerating, respectively. To counteract such roll or pitch, the object of Van Der Knaap is to provide an anti-roll/pitch mechanism for counteracting these rolling or pitching movements. See Column 1, lines 18-28. Thus, the configuration of the suspension system of Van Der Knaap inherently causes the vehicle body to move in the same direction as the forces being imposed on the vehicle (e.g., the body tilts outwardly during cornering) to which the anti-roll/pitch mechanism attempts to counteract against, whereas in the suspension recited in Claim 89, the body moves in the opposite direction of the force (e.g., the body tilts inwardly during cornering).

Claim 89 further recites that the suspension system includes a load control system interposed and interconnecting the body, the vehicle support assembly and/or the tie structure(s). The load control system generates a resistance to the movement of the pitch or roll center(s) which is greater than the resistance generated by the load control system to the movement of the center of gravity of the vehicle due to forces applied to the vehicle during operation of the vehicle. After a review of the FIGURES and detailed description of Van Der Knaap, Applicant respectfully asserts that Van Der Knaap fails to teach that "the load control system generates a resistance to the movement of the pitch or roll center(s) which is greater than the resistance generated by the load control system to the movement of the center of gravity of the vehicle due to forces applied to the vehicle during operation of the vehicle."

It is clear from the foregoing that Van Der Knaap fails to teach or suggest the recited combination of features of amended Claim 89. Thus, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with regard to Claim 89. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections under Section 102(b) of Claims 90, 105, and 116-117, which depend from allowable Claim 89.

#### New Claims 188 and 189

New Claims 188 and 189 have been added to particularly point out and distinctly claim the novel aspects of the present invention. Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 188 reads on the elected species. New Claims 188 and 189 depend from Claim 89, and for at least the reasons described above, applicant asserts the newly submitted claims recite combinations of features neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 188 and 189 are in condition for allowance.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant submits that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. If any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>



Brandon C. Stallman  
Registration No. 46,468  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1708

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first-class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date:

February 9, 2007 Fatima Subile

BCS:jam

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100